



**Awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content website
users and non-users towards privacy in Bulgaria:
a qualitative study**

Noellie Brockdorff¹, Sandra Appleby-Arnold¹, Christine Garzia¹, Bogdan
Manolea², Ioana Vasiiu³, Alexandra Tsvetkova⁴

¹ Department of Cognitive Science, University of Malta, Msida, Malta

² Association for Technology and Internet, Bucharest, Romania

³ Faculty of Law, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

⁴ Law and Internet Foundation, Sofia, Bulgaria

April 2013



*This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme
for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 285582.*

CONSENT

Consumer Sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content (UGC) services in the digital economy
(G.A. 244643).

The project was co-financed by the European Union within the Seventh Framework Programme (2007-2013).
<http://www.consent.law.muni.cz>

The views expressed in this report are the sole responsibility of the authors
and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union

Correspondence about this report should be addressed to
Noellie Brockdorff, Department of Cognitive Science, University of Malta, Msida, MSD2080, Malta
noellie.brockdorff@um.edu.mt

Table of Contents

1. Key Findings	3
2. Introduction	4
2.1. Study Target	4
2.2. Methodology	5
2.3. Description of the Sample	6
3. Results	7
3.1. Attitudes towards UGC websites	7
3.2. Information Disclosure – “Offline” and Online	9
3.3. Privacy Matters	12
3.3.1. Which Privacy matters: Awareness and (Non-)Acceptance	12
3.3.2. How Privacy matters: Protective Measures	14
3.3.3. Making Privacy matter: Evaluating Privacy Policies	16
4. Conclusion: Forced Consumers – Educated Consumers	18
 Acknowledgements	 19
 Appendices	 20
A.1 Interview Guidelines (English)	20
A.2 Interview Guidelines (Bulgarian)	28
B. Pre-Analysis Template	37

1. Key Findings

This document presents the Bulgaria results of a qualitative study undertaken as part of the CONSENT project (work package 8). The analyses and results are based on a set of ten semi-structured in-depth interviews regarding the awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content (UGC) website users towards privacy. The interview guideline consisted of 27 questions and sub-questions.

The selection of interviewees was aiming at a 8:2 split between UGC users and non-users, an even gender distribution, and a further split by age group to ensure as wide a representation as possible. However, the data did not reveal any strong links between the interviewees' attitudes and their different gender or age, confirming the result from the previous quantitative study (CONSENT work package 7).

Generally, from the interviewees' responses privacy as a reason for (non-)disclosure of personal and private information could be divided into different – though partially overlapping – categories: information being perceived as generally “too private” (and, thus, not to be disclosed); information regarded as “personal” – though not very private – and its disclosure linked to the perceived risk of fraud; and information that was considered as “not relevant” for others.

The majority of Bulgarian interviewees were not aware of the various practices of website owners before opening a UGC account, and only some of them did become aware afterwards. Regarding different acceptance levels, the customisation of content was mostly accepted either due to a lack of concern, self-ascribed personal responsibility, or as a common commercial practice. Websites owners passing on of personal and private information to others was also accepted by the majority of respondents, though mostly under the condition that prior consent would be sought, or that their data would be anonymised. Selling such information to other companies or gathering in-depth information was only accepted by a minority; non-acceptance was either due to a perceived violation of social norms, whereas acceptance was linked to the condition of anonymity and depending on what specific personal information would be sold and/or gathered.

Regarding specific measures to protect their privacy, most Bulgarian UGC users adapted their privacy settings, some of them in a rather reflective and pro-active way. However, privacy policies themselves were only partially read; either due to perceived difficulties in the policies' form and structure, but mostly because of a belief that privacy policies serve no useful purpose for website users. The Bulgarian respondents showed little belief that laws or regulations would enforce their rights, and it rather appeared that policies were perceived as – intentionally or unintentionally – serving the primary purpose of protecting the website owners rather than the website users.

Bulgarian respondents revealed a wide variation of self-perceptions in the context of UGC usage, oscillating between “forced consumers” and “educated consumers”. However, it appeared as well that (self-)ascriptions of user responsibility and, occasionally, a certain level of “nonchalance” and denial, were ultimately only masking a desire to obtain more security and protection in an environment where privacy is highly valued – but not (yet) taken for granted.

2. Introduction

2.1 Study Target

The analyses and results in this document are based on a set of semi-structured in-depth interviews regarding the awareness, values and attitudes of user generated content (UGC) website users towards privacy. This study was undertaken as part of the CONSENT¹ project.

This document highlights the findings from the study that are relevant to Bulgaria. Other separate reports are available for Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

The interview guideline used in this study consisted of 27 questions and sub-questions, covering general internet usage and its perceptions, individual attitudes and behaviour regarding the specific usage of UGC websites, probing in particular those related to the disclosure of personal and private information. Here, the interview design was specifically aiming at gaining an in-depth understanding of individual levels of awareness and (non-) acceptance concerning website owners' practices of using such information for various commercial purposes, the experienced, expected – or unexpected – consequences, and the related strategies of users as well as of non-users.

¹ “Consumer Sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content (UGC) services in the digital economy” (CONSENT; G.A. 244643) – which was co-financed by the European Union under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (SSH-2009-3.2.1. “Changes in Consumption and Consumer Markets”).

2.2 Methodology

Overall 130 interviews – ten in each country (see above) – were conducted between May and July 2012. Personal references and snowball techniques were used to find individuals willing to take part in this study which, as a qualitative analysis, does not claim to be representative for an entire EU population or any of the individual EU countries where interviews were conducted.

However, in order to gather a more in-depth insight into the individual perceptions, attitudes and behaviour as revealed in the quantitative study of the CONSENT project's work package 7, the participating partner countries were required to select interviewees following certain quota that would ensure representation of different sub-groups:

Total Number of Interviews = 10			
UGC users		8	4 male / 4 female, of which at least 6 use SNS (at least 1 male and 1 female), and 2 (1 male and 1 female) that use UGC, but not SNS.
UGC non-users		2	1 male / 1 female
of which			
Gender	Male	5	
	Female	5	
Location	Urban/ suburban	8	4 male / 4 female
	Rural	2	1 male / 1 female
Age group	15-24	3	
	25-34	3	of which 1 UGC non-user
	35-44	2	
	45+	2	of which 1 UGC non-user

The breakdown of interviewees' characteristics comprised, as a basic categorisation, the 8:2 split between UGC users and non-users (preferably including two UGC but non-SNS users), and an even gender distribution. Then, the interview requirements were split further down by location and age group, aiming at as wide a representation as possible whilst keeping the total number of interviews per CONSENT partner at a manageable level.

After conducting the interviews, all interviews were fully transcribed in the local language, and a pre-analysis template for each interview was filled out in English. The development of this template was based on pilot interviews conducted earlier, and it served primarily for the collating, formal structuring and pre-coding of the vast amount of collected data. Then, the content of each set of country templates was analysed section by section, labelling them with additional codes which either summarised specific processes and practices or constructions and interpretations². This process of re-coding also initialised a critical restructuring and rethinking of the codes applied first, and allowed for a more focussed data analysis and drawing together overarching themes. Finally, a draft version of each country report was submitted to the respective partner for revision and amendments.

² Data could fall into different categories at the same time and were then also double-coded as such.

2.3 Description of the Sample

The data analysis for Bulgaria is based on ten interviews with a demographic distribution which – with the exception of only one UGC (non-SNS) user being included rather than the required two UGS (non-SNS) users – fully complies with the required quota:

Interviewee No.	Gender	Age	Age category	Location category	UGC usage
I-1	Male	30	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-2	Male	24	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-3	Female	22	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-4	Male	27	25-34	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-5	Male	50	45+	Urban/Suburban	UGC (non-SNS) user
I-6	Female	19	15-24	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-7	Female	42	35-44	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-8	Male	34	25-34	Rural	UGC non- user
I-9	Female	37	35-44	Urban/Suburban	UGC user
I-10	Female	56	45+	Rural	UGC non-user

Within the age group of 15-24, though, young users at the lower end of this range are not represented, as all interviewees are at least 19 years old, but in all other age categories a comparably even split was achieved.

While six interviews were conducted within the respective respondent's workplace, the rest was conducted in a variety of public places, with the exception of one respondent whose interview took place at his house. Most interviewees were relaxed and responded openly; only one (I-10, SNS/UGC non-user, female, 56) appeared rather nervous and to have difficulties in putting herself in the situations portrayed during the interview.

All interviewees (with the exception of I-6, I-8 and I-10, who indicated 7 to 8, 3 to 4, 2 years of usage respectively) have been using the internet for at least ten years. Looking at the relation between UGC usage and the age when these respondents started to use the internet, there is no strong recognisable link between being a "digital native" or a "digital initiate". However, with regards to the usage of UGC websites, both non-users (I-8 and I-10) have been using the internet for less than 4 years.

Interviewee No.	Age	Years of Internet usage	Age when starting to use the Internet	UGC usage
I-1	30	10-12	18-20	UGC user
I-2	24	10	14	UGC user
I-3	22	10	12	UGC user
I-4	27	12	15	UGC user
I-5	50	17-18	32-33	UGC (non-SNS) user
I-6	19	7-8	11-12	UGC user
I-7	42	20	22	UGC user
I-8	34	3-4	30-31	UGC non-user
I-9	37	12-13	24-25	UGC user
I-10	56	2	54	UGC non-user

3. Results

3.1 General Online Attitudes

Of those eight interviewees who are UGC users, five declared that they perceived a certain peer pressure to join a social networking site (primarily Facebook); as one respondent aptly expressed it: *“At the beginning I refused to create an account in Facebook for a long time and numerous friends kept convincing me to create an account. In the end I gave up and did it.”* (I-2, UGC user).

Other interviewees (I-4, I-6, UGC users) recalled how they started using Facebook because *“a lot of my friends and acquaintances were using it”* (I-6, UGC user), and one expressed that given a lot of her friends were registered on Facebook, she did not want to feel excluded because of her lack of online presence: *“I always think that I might have missed something or somewhere to visit, to see, to gossip”* (I-7, UGC user).

On the other hand, one respondent - who was no longer a SNS user - recounted how he initially gave in to curiosity rather than to peer pressure: *“I received about fifty, sixty e-mail invitations for Facebook and at the end I said to myself - well, we will see what it is”* (I-1, UGC). This curiosity was not only present on a personal level, but also on a professional level: *“As someone who deals with these technologies, I have to know what is happening in this social network after all”* (I-1, UGC user).

Additionally, another reason given by respondents was the wish to maintain contact with those *“I cannot maintain a close contact with”* (I-4, UGC user); in this instance, such contact was facilitated by SNS. As expressed by one interviewee, *“it is nice to communicate with people that I rarely see in person, even old acquaintances – people that I haven’t seen for years”* (I-2, UGC user). Using SNS, here, was deemed as an especially good way to re-establish contact with friends who left the country. Recalling a friend who went to live abroad, one respondent remarked that *“I really liked that only by a name I can find a person that lives in the States, the UK...”* (I-9, UGC user).

A minority of interviewees who made use of SNS showed a more negative attitude, perceiving its usage, for instance, as a *“waste of time”* (I-2, UGC user). A rather strong reaction came from one particular respondent who discontinued his use of SNS both due to privacy reasons as well as due to *“the insane bullshit that is online”*. In fact he described himself as becoming *“estranged from the sites of mass communication. I don’t miss them at all”* (I-1, UGC user). For another interviewee, her negative attitude was linked to the inability to remove a photo of herself she had posted, which led to unsolicited communication with strangers: *“I wanted to remove my picture but I couldn’t, and unwelcome people who have obviously seen my picture are writing to me”* (I-9, UGC user).

Regarding the usage of other (non-SNS) UGC websites, a number of respondents described themselves as passive users and mentioned that such use was related to seeking information – either related to hobbies, or for work-related reasons. Other reasons for usage included participating in forums and sharing pictures. With specific regards to forums, it seemed that some respondents who had registered in order to take part in forums did not use them

anymore for a variety of reasons, including losing interest (I-6, UGC user) and being *“quite grown-up now for this sort of thing”* (I-2, UGC user).

The two UGC non-users stated that they did not make use of such types of websites for rather different reasons. One of these respondents expressed a general lack of interest in using SNS: *“I am not interested in such types of things...I don’t need them”*, and, more specifically, stated a preference to communicate with her friends in an offline manner: *“I don’t see the point. Even with a friend – I prefer to sit with her, drink coffee and talk instead of talking via internet”* (I-10, UGC non-user).

The other UGC non-user also showed a great reluctance to use the internet in general but, additionally, he expressed his concern that in order to register for UGC sites he has to supply his personal information: *“Yes, this always bothers me and maybe this is one of the reasons for not doing it. Because my personal data are being required absolutely everywhere and it is not normal for me [...] to publish it”* (I-8, UGC non-user).

This concern with privacy issues was also shown particularly by two UGC users who expressed a rather strong negative attitude towards SNS. One of them - a previous SNS user - expressed concern about the consequences of providing personal information, and in particular how the information itself has been used: *“The feeling that you have a personal life that is only for yourself and it is being, to put it mildly, destroyed...in general, your private life becomes public”* (I-1, UGC user).

The other UGC user with privacy concerns was specifically bothered with the *“absolutely necessary”* information required to register with some sites:

“Two pages with questions - I looked and I closed it - I wanted to make use of the site [but] that it made me give up immediately. I believe that the internet is a database for general use, and it shouldn’t be too much interested in me” (I-5, UGC user).

Generally, it appeared that online communication (as well as online entertainment) played a less important role in internet usage for most respondents. The dominant reason given for using the internet was the availability and ease of access to information, which was mentioned by the majority of respondents. The internet was described by many as providing *“quick access to all kinds of information”* (I-2, UGS user), and as a means to *“digging and looking for something I’m interested in”* (I-7, UGS user). The respondents’ use of the internet seemed to stem more from pragmatic purposes; as one respondent remarked: *“It is just one tremendous convenience”* (I-6, UGC user).

Some respondents also mentioned the downside of this access to information, including the risk of coming across *“inaccurate information”* (I-6, UGC user) and that *“sometimes the unnecessary information is too much”* (I-4, UGC user). In relation to the aspect of online communication, a number of disadvantages were mentioned as well, including the risk that people *“you don’t want to communicate with enter your life”* (I-3, UGC user), the *“vulgarity of some people”* (I-7, UGC user), and the risk that *“someone can spy on you via the net”* (I-9, UGC user).

3.2 Information Disclosure – “Offline” and Online

In order to gain an insight into how the behaviour of UGC users and non-users corresponds with their attitudes and perceptions “offline” (e.g. regarding privacy-related social norms), respondents were encouraged to imagine a situation where, whilst travelling on a plane, a stranger would ask them a number of personal questions – whether they would reveal their marital status, their income, and their ID card number. After that, they were requested to talk about their reaction if the same questions were asked by a friend.

In “offline” situations, the majority of interviewees gave very similar answers regarding whether or not they would disclose certain personal or private information³ to a stranger. Being asked for their marital status was mostly considered to be a rather typical question, and as giving away a piece of information that is somewhat public: *“not sort of [...] confidential in any way”* (I-3, UGC user). In fact, most respondents said that they would portray *“the real situation”* (I-4, UGC user) and *“the truth”* (I-6, UGC user). Divulging this information was generally not considered as presenting a risk: *“I don’t see any point in hiding this”* (I-5, UGC user). On the other hand, some interviewees did express a certain degree of ambivalence, as one interviewee stated: *“I might answer – I might not answer”* (I-8, UGC non user).

On the contrary, information about income and the ID card number would generally not be revealed, albeit for different reasons. Being asked by a stranger for one’s salary was considered as too personal, improper and a question that violates social norms. Such a request was deemed *“inappropriate”* (I-8, UGC non-user) and, as adamantly expressed by another respondent, *“it is none of his business”* (I-1, UGC user). Only one respondent stated that she would reply to such a question: *“I think that it is not something that I would hide”* (I-7, UGC user).

Being asked for one’s ID card number, though – described as *“personal information”* (I-4, UGC user) – was perceived as intrusive and violating privacy. This situation was often met by reactions of astonishment and disbelief, implying that social norms had clearly been violated: *“I would be really surprised”* (I-3, UGC user), and: *“Absurd. There is no way for him to get my ID card number”* (I-8, UGC non-user). In addition to such reactions, the respondents expressed a deep sense of mistrust: *“I wouldn’t believe in such a thing”* (I-10, UGC non user). They seemed concerned about the consequences of divulging such personal information; in particular, they expressed the view that this could be subject to misuse – *“I have heard a lot of abuses”* (I-7, UGC user) – and, in addition, subject to unlawful use: *“It [...] may be used for illegal purposes”* (I-4, UGC user).

³ The distinction made here between “personal” and “private” is following educational definitions where personal information cannot be used to identify someone (in the sense of identity theft), whereas private information can be used to identify someone and may be unsafe to share. This distinction is currently not being made in data protection law which only refers to “personal” data/information, in common language both terms are often used synonymously, within the various scientific disciplines there is a wealth of different definitions, and there are also different meanings in different languages. However, many respondents intuitively differentiated between the two terms – by ascribing to them different levels – or “types” (e.g. ownership vs. spatial relationship) – of privacy.

In a conversation with friends, all interviewees responded similarly that they would reveal their marital status. In general, they expressed that this information was not “*secret*” (I-5, UGC user), and that in such a situation they would divulge their marital status without any qualms: “*Of course*” (I-3, UGC user). Only one respondent put a condition on this, expressing that his decision would depend on whether it was “*someone that I have known for a long time*” (I-8, UGC non-user).

On the other hand, the majority of respondents - with just a few exceptions - stated that they would still not be willing to reveal their income and ID card number. With regards to their income, this was still considered as being confidential: “*I will keep the answer to myself*” (I-4, UGC user) and, hence, information which was not to be disclosed: “*Even for people that I know it is still private information*” (I-5, UGC user). However, a number of respondents stated that they would provide an elusive reply – “*The answer would be [my salary is] ‘enough’*” (I-8, UGC non-user) – or consider giving a rough idea of their income: “*I don’t think that I would tell her the exact amount*” (I-6, UGC user), and “*I would give some information, but not precise*” (I-3, UGC user).

With regards to the ID card number, the majority of respondents perceived it as still very personal and, even with friends, such a request was often met by feelings of mistrust: “*I don’t think he really needs it*” (I-2, UGC user). One respondent argued that knowing the person does not automatically mean that it is safe to divulge the information: “*It [...] may be used for illegal purposes by both known and unknown people*” (I-4, UGC user). With regards to how the respondents would deal when faced with such a situation, the reactions were various. One respondent expressed that “*I may joke about it*” (I-5, UGC user), most probably with the intent of hinting, in an indirect and polite way, at the inappropriateness of their friend’s request, and hence that social norms were violated. Other respondents stated that there would have to be a valid justification for the exchange of personal data with a friend; such justification could, for instance, included a work-related situation - otherwise it was perceived as “*absurd*” (I-9, UGC user). Only two respondents claimed that they would divulge such information - one of them, though, rather hesitantly: “*When I know the person, I have more trust in him or her, I guess*” (I-7, UGC user). The other respondent was of the belief that it “*is not something that could harm me so badly, and, in general, harm me at all*” (I-1).

Whereas the interviewees’ responses revealed a comparably homogeneous pattern of answering in offline situations with both strangers and friends, there was a wider variation in answers regarding what information would be disclosed online in the context of online shopping / commercial trade-offs, and even more so on UGC websites.⁴

Generally, for commercial advantages the majority of interviewees were willing to reveal their date of birth, their marital status, and the number and age of kids. All other information, in particular home insurance, life insurance and ID card number, was indicated by the majority of respondents as not to be disclosed; here, privacy as a reason for non-disclosure was partially, though mostly indirectly, referred to.

⁴ For commercial trade-offs, interviewees were asked whether they would disclose their phone number, address, date of birth, marital status, income, number and age of kids, their spouse’s email address, their home insurance, life insurance, and their ID card number.

Regarding the disclosure of personal and private information on UGC websites, the majority of interviewees indicated that they had revealed their name, photos of themselves and, in some cases, photos of friends and family members, as well as tastes and opinions. A minority had also disclosed their hobbies, sports and places visited; however, there were no reasons given for the disclosure or non-disclosure of this information.

Finally, being strongly engaged in UGC usage did not necessarily go alongside with a greater willingness to disclose information for commercial trade-offs, and being open to commercial trade-offs was not visibly linked to a more “generous” disclosure of personal and private information on UGC sites.

3.3 Privacy Matters

3.3.1 Which Privacy matters: Awareness and (Non-)Acceptance

Only three interviewees (two UGC users, one UGC non-user) indicated that they were aware before opening a UGC website account that website owners may use personal information provided by users to customise their site's content. In general, such awareness developed as a result of either personal observation or due to reading the general terms and conditions⁵.

Four respondents, all UGC users, became aware of this only after opening the account. One of these interviewees stated that if he had been aware of such a practice he would not have signed up in the first place: *"I wouldn't do it again if I had the option"* (I-4, UGC user). These respondents became aware of content customisation through different means. One respondent learnt about this upon his registration on Facebook, whilst another one heard about this practice for the first time only during the interview. The remaining interviewees did not provide an answer; in particular one UGC non-user (I-10) could not quite understand the various hypothetical situations depicted during the interview, and she found it specifically difficult to grasp the notion behind the practice of customising content.

Acceptance levels and the underlying motivation for acceptance differed depending on the respective website owners' practice. The customising of content was accepted by the majority of respondents (seven), whereas for one respondent this was acceptable only under the condition of previous consent. The reasons behind this acceptance were rather wide-ranging. Two users felt that *"it may even be useful to some extent"* (I-4, UGC user), two other users showed a lack of concern. Whilst one respondent reasoned that she had nothing to worry about since she was careful about the information she shared – *"I try to be frugal so [...] I don't feel [...] terribly threatened"* (I-6, UGC user). The other respondent claimed not to be concerned *"because nothing bad has happened to me yet"* (I-7, UGC user).

Other interviewees considered the customisation of content as practice which is commonly known and seemed to hold the belief that the onus should be on the user to deal with the situation. *"Personally, I don't approve of it but after all, as I have told you, this seems to me the most logical thing. If I don't want my data to be processed in such way, I should simply not register anywhere on [the] internet"* (I-2, UGC user). Other respondents explained their understanding of this practice from a business perspective: *"The dealer seeks every opportunity to get to the information he needs and the client to whom to sell his products, and that's his job"* (I-5, UGC user). However, they simultaneously expressed mixed feelings and some discomfort: *"It's cleverly invented - it's well invented - but I wouldn't like it in the moment that they are doing this, as they offer me this [...] it means that information is available to a wider audience than I suspect"* (I-3, UGC user).

⁵ With regards to the other practices, there was limited information in relation to when and how the interviewees became aware of the different other prevailing practices of website owners: passing on personal information to third parties without the user's permission, sending unwanted emails or newsletters, selling personal or private information to other companies, or gathering in-depth information about users.

Lastly, only one respondent, a UGC non-user who has no active registrations, perceived the practice of customisation of content as completely unacceptable; in addition, he expressed both disbelief and serious concern: *"Absurd [...] I may even be scared if such thing happens to me"* (I-8, UGC non-user).

Regarding the website owners practice of passing on personal information without the user's permission, acceptance levels start to decrease. Out of those respondents who still accepted it, only two respondents (I-2, I-7, both UGC users) accepted such a practice straight away without expressing the need for any particular conditions: *"Why not?"* (I-7, UGC user). On the other hand, five of the respondents' acceptance mainly depended upon two particular conditions – either only if given consent, or under the condition of data being anonymised. *"If certain anonymity is kept, yes [...] The moment when more things about me start to become clear such as the desirable salary, such as any personal data that could identify me – no"* (I-4, UGC user).

Only one of these respondents expressed that some sort of incentive would make a difference. *"I think that it's not right [that] such information about me appears without my consent, [but] I would be more willing if there was remuneration"* (I-6, UGC user). Finally, such a practice was perceived as being outright unacceptable by just one respondent: *"if I had sent this information and it was meant for the people that I had considered sending it to or trusting them, but other people watched it, it would annoy me for sure"* (I-8, UGC non-user).

The practice of receiving commercial offers as a consequence of having disclosed personal or private information online was subject to mixed reactions by the respondents⁶. One respondent found this practice acceptable by simply ignoring it: *"I delete them [...] I don't open them at all"* (I-9, UGC user). Another one perceived it *"as something normal"* unless it becomes too aggressive: *"Yes, if it is not too much [...] Well, there are certain boundaries [...] maybe there is some line where [...] the communication is too much"* (I-7, UGC user). On the other hand, two respondents did find such practice unacceptable: *"People with some offers like that have called me and it is annoying. I don't like it"* (I-8, UGC non-user).

The selling of personal and private information to other companies was also subject to quite a range of different reactions. Such a practice was deemed acceptable by two respondents, albeit as expressed by one of them: *"I prefer my information not to be used but, for sure, it is used this way and in many more different ways"* (I-2, UGC user). Such a view may imply a certain degree of helplessness vis-à-vis personal information being exploited by such companies. On the other hand, two respondents would accept such a practice under particular conditions; for one respondent (I-3, UGC user), it would depend on the type of information shared, while the other one would accept upon the condition of anonymity: *"Yes, as long as [...] anonymity is being kept"* (I-6, UGC user). Lastly, such practice was considered as unacceptable by three respondents, as *"it is not right [for] someone else to gain money because of information about me"* (I-4, UGC user).

Finally, in relation to the practice of gathering in-depth information, the respondents' replies exhibited a similarly wide variation. Three respondents considered such a practice as being

⁶ Only four out of the ten respondents provided an answer to this question.

generally acceptable, although drawing the line at the gathering of ‘sensitive’ information, including health-related information: *“When it is about certain things that don’t step in too personally in my space - right, we’ve talked about health status, sexual status - but are related to my profession, my character – ok”* (I-7, UGC user). On the other hand, two respondents would accept it under the condition of previous consent, depending on whether being notified in advance.

One interviewee clearly distinguished between the gathering of information and the purposeful processing of this information, finding the latter entirely unacceptable without her prior consent, and two others expressed their concern not only regarding the information storage itself, but also about the possibility of subsequent uncontrollable use at any later point in time:

“Considering that practically the information once uploaded on Facebook [...] Even if it is not available to the users, it continues to be stored there. I don’t think I would have registered if [I had known about this]” (I-4, UGC user).

“I feel like a person who is being watched all the time... this information might be differently used depending on the case. So [...] even if it is this way for the moment, you never know for what someone else will use it someday” (I-8, UGC non-user).

3.3.2 How Privacy matters: Protective Measures

In relation to UGC users’ main privacy related concerns, these primarily revolved around one topic: the aforementioned perceived uncertainty about who has access to personal and private information online. In order to “disconnect” – rather than protect – the revealed information from potential personal consequences, one method chosen by users was not to reveal their real name on UGC websites. Six out of the eight UGC users indicated making use of nicknames on a variety of occasions albeit, for the majority, such usage was not consistent.

Only one user expressed that *“in almost all cases I use a nickname”* (I-1, UGC user), whereas others stated more of a preference rather than exclusive use of nicknames. In general, the tendency to employ a nickname depended on the type of site. For instance, one respondent who in general provided her real name decided to use a nickname for a particular site which she wanted to use as *“a limited channel, with specific people”* (I-3, UGC user). Only one respondent pointed out that using a nickname was not a “fool proof” way to avoid being identified: *“I have the feeling that so much personal data leak from there and it could be connected to a person even if [...] they have not registered with, let’s say, their real name, [or] age”* (I-5, UGC user), representing a certain awareness that a full disconnection may often be an illusion, as the real name is only one of many possible personal identifiers.

A main strategy to deal with the aforementioned uncertainty was to adapt the privacy settings of UGC websites – if such an option was available and known of. Five out of eight UGC users stated that they limited access to their profile to varying degrees. One user whose profile was public changed the default settings in order to limit access to photos and video

recordings to *“a limited circle of people”* (I-9, UGC user). Two other users had their profile limited to ‘only friends’, one of them additionally changing her settings in order to block specific people from viewing her profile, the reason being that *“as in personal life [...] one does not want to share everything [...] or does not want to share specific things in front of everyone”* (I-3, UGC user). Other interviewees exhibited different forms of “dynamic” handling of privacy settings, like the exclusion of specific individuals (as mentioned above) and defining specific user groups. One user categorised his ‘friends’ in groups and controls which information could be seen by those in the various groups: *“I choose [...] how much I want to keep in touch with them and how much I want them to know what is going on with me”* (I-4, UGC user).

Another interviewee described how *“at a time I even secured the profile in such way that the comments I wrote were visible only to me”*, being *“a little bit insane”* (I-1, UGC user). Ultimately, this respondent also decided to de-activate his profile, mainly due to the belief that *“eventually everyone knows where [one] has been, what [one] has done and so on...”* (I-1, UGC user) – depicting a situation where he clearly felt a substantial loss of privacy.

Another strategy mentioned by a number of participants in order to safeguard their privacy was to be “careful” about the *kind* of content posted: *“I always ponder in advance what exactly to share”* (I-1, UGC user), and *“I do it very selectively”* (I-2, UGC user). This cautiousness was the main reason for two out of three UGC users to keep their profile public: *“I try to provide information [...] that I consider that in no way [will it] compromise me, embarrass me or be used against me in the future”* (I-2, UGC user). Other users pointed out that they were wary about the *amount* of content posted: *“I have tried and, to a certain extent I believe, that I have succeeded in providing very limited information about me”* (I-3, UGC user).

Overall, respondents stated that they had not yet experienced any negative consequences from their information disclosure, ascribing this mainly due to the fact that in general they were rather cautious in relation to the type and amount of information they provide: *“It is mandatory for me to think twice”* (I-4, UGC user). However, one interviewee, whilst not regretting having posted any specific information, did express concern and a lack of control about the dissemination of personal information by others:

“The friends on Facebook, that I have [...] to some extent are friends among each other, there are overlaps [...] and, actually, whether I am tagged or not has little influence, because most people are connected among themselves and if, for example, a photo of me is shown, or there appears information that concerns me in any way, it is easily accessible by anyone that is a friend of mine” (I-4, UGC user).

In order to pre-empt such a situation from happening, he described a consensus he found with his friends: *“We have an arrangement [that] nothing [is] to be uploaded [...] without the permission of the person in the photo”* (I-4, UGC user). Here, it appears that risks from personal or private information disclosure online cannot be controlled merely online but are perceived as requiring additional “offline” arrangements.

3.3.3 Making Privacy matter: Evaluating Privacy Policies

Four out of the eight interviewed UGC users claimed that they mostly do read privacy policies: *“In general [...] I try to read them”* (I-7, UGC user), whilst one UGC user, along with one of the UGC non-users, stated that reading privacy policies happens *“very rarely”* (I-8, UGC non-user). The three remaining UGC users, along with one of the UGC non-users, asserted that they do not read privacy policies at all.

The reasons given for not reading privacy policies were twofold. Firstly, two respondents – one UGC user and one UGC non-user – indicated that they were, actually, not aware of the existence of privacy policies: *“I don’t know that there are such pages”* (I-6, UGC user). On the other hand, one respondent argued that reading privacy policies was a rather futile exercise since providers cannot be trusted:

“I am aware that everything that I put on internet, someone may use it [...] now whether I like it or not, this is the situation [...] even if there is a law, the owners will do whatever they want unless they are caught. So this is what I’ve considered and that’s why I haven’t read” (I-9, UGC user).

Another respondent pointed out that it was absurd for users to claim with any certainty of having understood privacy policies: *“In general, it is the biggest lie of our times - to have read the general terms and to be familiar with them”* (I-2, UGC user). It seemed that such a perception was also shared with some of those who *do* read privacy policies. Whereas one of the readers pointed out that such terms are not *“subject to additional negotiation”* (I-4, UGC user), other readers perceived the policies as serving the primary purpose of protecting the website owners rather than the website users: *“For sure it is made on purpose [...] I have noticed that I have missed information that actually concerns me. So, what I think of the policies - they are made to serve the interests of the companies”* (I-3, UGC user).

Dealing with such lengthy policies, some respondents indicated that they mostly read *“selectively”* (I-7, UGC user), for instance by looking out for the ways in which *“the contract might be breached [by the provider]”* (I-1, UGC user).

Furthermore, reading or non-reading may also depend on the extent to which there is a belief that certain protective measures can actually be found. Some readers stated that they particularly searched for the specific treatment of their personal and private data, looking out for *“mainly what rights [...] the owner of the page has upon handling the [...] information that I have published and how much is restricted in passing it on to third parties”* (I-4, UGC user). Generally, they revealed a strong interest in several forms of maintaining control – control over who their information was shared with, control over what specific information was potentially passed on to these others, and control over how long it would be shared.

But despite the critical statements mentioned earlier, a number of the respondents also felt rather helpless and displayed a passive attitude: *“In a way, I am a forced consumer [...] if I want to use the service I have to agree with these general terms related to the processing of personal data”* (I-4, UGC user). Nonetheless, three respondents clearly expressed that they would refuse to register if for some reason or other they did not agree with the privacy policies: *“I would stop [...] if I really don’t like something”* (I-7, UGC user). Only one

respondent stated that he would still register unless there was *“something that had strongly impressed me to give up the registration itself”* (I-1, UGC user). On the other hand, one respondent showed a decidedly more-proactive attitude: *“I would probably initiate some sort of correspondence with the site in question to specify and to make some disclaimers to the general conditions in a few points”* (I-9, UGC user), and, if not satisfied, claiming that she would either not register at all, or accept the terms and conditions – but provide false information.

Ultimately, it appeared that whether or not privacy policies were evaluated as worth reading was strongly linked to a deeper uncertainty which raised general concern and mistrust: *“...it is not known what is being gathered, by whom, where he stores it, who takes it, why he takes it [...] The way it is happening is not clear.”* (I-1, UGC user).

4. Conclusion: Forced Consumers – Educated Consumers

In the beginning of each interview, the respondents were asked to give their spontaneous associations with a number of terms: honesty, internet, work, family, privacy. The subsequent results show a particularly interesting contrast between the first and the last of them – honesty and privacy. Whereas honesty was mostly described as an established value and a social norm, the respondents' associations with privacy were substantially different. Rather than being ascribed a normative character, privacy appeared in these descriptions as a feeling linked to “confidentiality” and “discretion”, as something “secret” and “locked” – and something that needs to be “protected” – a safe place.

Regarding online privacy, the Bulgarian respondents revealed, generally, a wide variation of awareness levels. A number of interviewees were mostly unaware of potential risks, blocked out or accepted feelings of discomfort and displayed a sense of helplessness: *“In a way, I am a forced consumer”* (I-4, UGC user).

On the other hand, some interviewees explicitly expressed their perception of potential risks, and their strong interest in maintaining control and protecting themselves. They ascribed an ability to keep control to one of two situations. Either by consciously engaging in self-regulation, mainly through exercising caution and employing strategies such as using nicknames and dynamic adaptation of privacy settings on UGC sites. Or they held the belief that consumers are “educated” and, hence, should be held responsible for their actions: *“I am an educated person, the consumers are educated and reasonable people, and they would have to consider what information they share. Since they have shared this information, let the site use it”* (I-9, UGC user).

Similarly, attitudes and behaviour regarding privacy policies ranged between complete non-awareness of their existence to active reading and probing them. However, most interviewees shared a deep sense of mistrust towards these policies, believing that they are designed to protect the website providers rather than the users. Ultimately, it appeared that (self-)ascriptions of user responsibility and, occasionally, a certain level of “nonchalance” and denial, were only masking the shared desire to obtain more security and protection in an environment where privacy is highly valued – but not taken for granted.

Acknowledgements

This research was carried out as part of CONSENT (Consumer sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content (UGC) services in the digital economy) a project that was funded by the European Union under the Seventh Framework Programme (2007-2013), Grant Agreement Number 244643.

Appendices

A.1 Interview Guidelines (English)

Instructions for Interviewers

As the intention of these interviews is to gain a deeper understanding of personal opinions, thoughts, feelings, experiences and behaviour towards privacy based on the quantitative results from WP7, it is crucial to allow the respondents to speak as freely as possible and allow them to develop their own chain of thought, rather than following a pre-defined yes/no or “multiple choice” pattern. Obviously, one of the main challenges for any interviewer conducting standardised open-ended interviews is to find the balance between allowing such openness *and* maintaining control – taking oneself back without losing the “red line” – and the wording of the interview questions is accounting for this.

However, conducting interviews about a complex subject will always remain a complex task, and the following practical recommendations are meant to help reducing at least some of the complexities involved.

Plan ahead: Make a definite appointment with the respondent in a location of her/his choice where she/he feels at ease, but keep in mind that it should be sufficiently private to allow for an interview without undue distractions or interruptions. Avoid tight time schedules, as feelings of pressure may – unwillingly – be passed on to the respondent.

Be familiar with the interview guidelines: Practice the questions beforehand, and read the questions-specific instructions (marked in italic letters) carefully. Stick to the guidelines and don't jump between questions.

Be familiar with the technical equipment: Make a short test recording before each interview to assure that the recording equipment is working fine and batteries are sufficiently charged.

Ask open questions: Particularly when probing an interviewee's response, it is tempting to ask suggestive questions (e.g. “So you think / don't think that...?”). Although not always possible, such yes/no questions should be mostly avoided. Attempt to remain asking open direct questions, and also use other probing techniques like empathy, expectant pauses or mirroring, giving the respondent sufficient time to elaborate.

Stay alert: Whilst it is important to be interactive, the interviewer's main task is to listen and observe throughout the conversation. It is also recommendable to remain alert and potentially make notes after the interview, as respondents often give crucial information immediately after the recording device is turned off.

Introduction	Briefing
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>[about 5 min]</p> <p>(a) Thank you</p> <p>(b) Your name</p> <p>(c) Purpose</p> <p>(d) Confidentiality</p> <p>(e) Duration</p> <p>(f) How interview will be conducted</p> <p>(g) Signature of consent on consent form</p>	<p>I would like to thank you for taking the time to meet me today. My name is-----and I would like to talk to you about the internet, what you like about it, what you dislike, and how you use it.</p> <p>As was mentioned when we set up this appointment, this interview is being carried out as part of the CONSENT project which is co-funded by the European Union. The CONSENT aims to gather views of internet users from all countries of the EU. If you wish I will give you more information about the CONSENT project at the end of the interview.</p> <p>Your opinion is very valuable for our study and will be taken into consideration when drawing up the final report.</p> <p>The interview should take less than one hour. I will be taping the session because I don't want to miss any of your comments. Although I will be taking some notes during the session, I can't possibly write fast enough to get it all down. Because we're on tape, please be sure to speak up so that we don't miss your comments.</p> <p>All responses will be kept confidential. This means your interview responses will only be shared with research team members and will ensure that any information we include in our report does not identify you as the respondent. Your name will not be connected with the answers in any way.</p> <p>Please read and sign this consent form. Do you have any questions on that?</p> <p>Remember, you don't have to talk about anything you don't want and you may end the interview at any time. Is that OK?</p> <p><i>Running Total: 5 min</i></p>
Objectives	Questions
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Word-association exercise</p> <p>[about 3 min]</p> <p>- establish top of</p>	<p>Q.1 To start off we are going to play a short game/carry out a short exercise: I will read out a word and I would like you to say the first couple of things that come to mind/pops into your head when you hear the word. Let's try an example first: What is the first thing that comes to mind if I say the word "summer"? Anything else?</p> <p><i>Encourage respondents to use short phrases or single words and to</i></p>

mind associations with privacy	<p><i>avoid lengthy descriptions and statements.</i></p> <p><i>Test words: honesty, internet, work, family, privacy</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 8 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Willingness to disclose personal information in various situations. [about 8 min]</p>	<p>Q.1.1 Now let's talk about something a little different. I would like you to imagine you are on a plane and the person next to you, somebody you don't know and who you are unlikely to ever meet again, is a really talkative member of the same sex about your age. He/she starts talking about different things and after 15 minutes he/she asks you whether you were single, married or in a relationship, what would you tell her/him?</p> <p><i>Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.</i></p> <p>Q.1.2 What if he/she asked you about how much you earn What would you do? <i>Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.</i></p> <p>Q.1.3 And what if they would tell you they can use their ID card number to choose lottery numbers to play. He/she asks you what your ID card number is. What would you do? <i>Let respondent reply freely, and if they don't give reasons why, only then ask further why/why not.</i></p> <p>Q.1.4 Now let's imagine that instead of this talkative fellow passenger, you were asked the same questions by a friend who you meet a few times a year. What would you do? <i>Probe about each of: whether you are single, married or in a relationship, how much you earn, ID card number. And in each case whether respondent would say the truth and why/why not</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 16 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Internet experience and attitudes [about 5 min]</p>	<p>Q.2 Let's talk a bit more about the internet now, how long have you been using the internet?</p> <p>Q.3 What do you love most about the internet?</p> <p>Q.4 What do you dislike most about the internet?</p> <p><i>Running Total: 21 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Underlying beliefs & attitudes to commercial/privac</p>	<p>Q.5 Imagine that you are visiting a website of a discount club, for example a site similar to Groupon <or similar, please choose the one most appropriate for your country>. The club offers up to 50% discounts on different consumer products and services (e.g. books, travel, household goods, and fashion items) to its</p>

<p>y trade-off</p> <p>[about 5 min]</p>	<p>members. The site is currently running a promotion and giving a discount up to 75% to all visitors who provide the site with more information than the standard name and email. Which information would you be willing to provide this website to get this up to 75% discount offer?</p> <p><i>Start reading out list: phone number, home address, date of birth, annual income, marital status, number of kids, age of kids, ID or passport number, email address of partner or spouse, life insurance status, home insurance status</i></p> <p><i>For items that respondent is <u>not</u> willing to provide information about to the website probe reason: Q5.i Why not? Or Why wouldn't you give you're...</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 26 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Internet usage</p> <p>[about 2 min]</p>	<p>Q.6 Please tell me a little about the internet websites you use in a typical week and what you use them for.</p> <p><i>Probe if Internet activities describe above (including usage of UGC and SNS) have an impact on the respondents' lifestyles, habits and social relationships (just 2 minutes for this question, so do not go into too many details).</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 28 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>UGC usage</p> <p>[about 5 min]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish whether UGC user or non-user - Establish whether SNS user - Establish UGC site used most frequently - Provides link to findings from online questionnaire <p><i>Show card A</i></p>	<p>Q.7 This is a list of some websites <show list of UGC sites used in each country for WP7 >. Could you please tell me whether you have accounts with (not just visit) any of them and if you do have an account how often you log in? <Make a note which whether respondent uses Social Networking Site and if not which UGC website respondent uses most></p> <p><i>Show card A:</i></p> <p>A. Social networking website such as Facebook, <Local SNS used in WP7></p> <p>B. Business networking websites such as LinkedIn, Xing.com</p> <p>C. Dating websites such as parship.com</p> <p>D. Websites where you can share photos, videos, etc, such as YouTube, Flickr</p> <p>E. Websites which provide recommendations and reviews (of films, music, books hotels etc), such as last.fm, tripadvisor</p> <p>F. Micro blogging sites such as twitter</p> <p>G. Wiki sites such as Wikipedia, myheritage</p> <p>H. Multiplayer online games such as secondlife.com, World of Warcraft</p>

	<p><i>Probe how much time is spent on social networks and UGC services daily/weekly (if not established already in Q6)</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 33 min</i></p>
<p>RESPONDENTS WHO DO <u>NOT</u> USE OR NO LONGER USE UGC SITES IN Q7</p> <p>Reasons for not using UGC sites [about 3 min]</p>	<p>Q.8 Why don't you have accounts with any of these sites, or why did you cancel or don't use them anymore? Anything else? <i>Probe fully, but make note of first and second reason given.</i></p> <p><i>We are interested in exploring further any reasons that relate to respondents' concerns about:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the consequences of giving information online, - how information about them is used, - whether UGC sites can be trusted, and - any other issue relating to privacy. <p><u><i>If privacy/information use/trust related issues not mentioned as a reason for not using (anymore)UGC sites ask:</i></u></p> <p>Q.9 For what reasons may you be likely to open an account – or not open account - with any of these sites soon? <i>Allow respondents to speak freely, but then gently probe to establish if respondent feels any pressure to open a UGC account;</i></p> <p><u><i>If any privacy/information use/trust related issues mentioned ask:</i></u></p> <p>Q10. You mentioned that one of the reasons (the reason) you don't use UGC sites is <whatever respondent said that relates to privacy/information use>. Can you tell me a bit more about what in particular concerns you? <i>Probe in depth to determine</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. what aspect of UGC sites respondent finds unacceptable, and why; ii. beliefs about how internet sites use information; iii beliefs about what UGC sites are for. <p><i>Running Total: 36 min</i></p>
<p>RESPONDENTS WHO USE UGC SITES IN Q7</p> <p>UGC sites - Motivations & Usage [about 6 min]</p> <p>Establish: - motivations for</p>	<p>Q.11 Why did you start using <Social Networking Site, if used. If respondent does not use Social Networking site, then UGC site in Q7 used most frequently>? Probe to determine key motivations for using site.</p> <p>Q. 12 During all of the time that you've been using these sites, what information about yourself have you put on the site/sites? <i>Allow respondents to take their time and reply in their own words but probe for: name, home address, photos of you, photos of family and friends, audio-video recordings, medical information, hobbies, sports, places where you've been, tastes and opinions, etc</i></p>

UGC use

- willingness to share information
- beliefs & attitudes on different types of information
- motivations for settings of who can view information

Q.13 Who can see your profile and/or your photos?

Probe Why have you set things up in that way?

Q.14 Have you ever regretted posting some information on one of these sites?

If yes: **Q.15 Can you tell me a little bit about it...what happened? Why did you regret the posting?**

If respondent does not mention commercial info & negative effects, then also ask 16.1 and 16.2

If no: **Q.16 Could you imagine a situation when you might regret it?**

Probe to determine whether lack of concern about respondent's own posting is due to:

- i. respondent posting little information, or*
- ii. always thinking carefully before posting, or*
- iii. thinking that it is no problem that everybody has access to information about them*

If NOT i and ii then ask:

16.1 Do you receive commercial info that you think is a result of the personal information that you have posted? If yes, how do you feel about this?

Probe to determine exactly:

- i. if the respondents are aware of consequences of putting information online*
- ii. why some are more acceptable than the others*
- iii. do people accept that receiving commercial info is part of the commercial trade-off for using the service*

16.2 What do you think can happen (for example regarding job selection, reputation) as a result of personal information you have posted?

If Yes- How do you think this will happen?

If No- Why don't you think this is possible?

Probe to determine exactly how the respondents think about other people using their own information posted on UGCs. Use a neutral tone to allow both positive and negative reactions.

Running Total: 42 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

If not previously established up to this point

Usage of

Q.17 Have you yourself ever used an alias or a nickname when giving information online? In what case/s and why? Or, if you

<p>aliases/nicknames [about 2 min]</p> <p>- explore attitudes towards revealing personal information in different situations</p>	<p>haven't, what do you think about it? <i>Probe more in detail.</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 44 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Attitudes towards use of personal information by websites [about 8 min]</p> <p><i>Show card B</i></p>	<p>Q.18 The information users include in their account or profile on a website can be used by the website owners for a number of purposes, such as to customize the content and advertising that users see, to send them emails, to gather in-depth personal information about them etc. Did you know this when you signed up with a website (or UGC/SNS)? What do you think of it?</p> <p><i>Make a note whether respondent was aware of purposes and probe to determine attitude to use of users' information for each of the following:</i> <i>Show card B:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. customize the advertising you see (show you only advertising for things/services that likely to interest you)</i> <i>2. share information (which could be linked to your name) about your behaviour with other parts of the company</i> <i>3. sell information (not linked to your name) about your behaviour to other companies</i> <p><i>For <u>each purpose</u> probe respondent for the reason behind finding the use acceptable/unacceptable.</i></p> <p><i>If not already mentioned, for any purpose respondent finds unacceptable ask:</i></p> <p>Q.19 Under which conditions, if any, would you find it acceptable for users to give information about themselves to be used by a website for < purpose respondent finds unacceptable>? <i>Probe to determine whether respondent would accept a ticket in a sweepstake/lottery, points on website such as Facebook points, a share of profits from the website, money.</i></p> <p><i>Running Total: 52 min</i></p>
<p>ALL RESPONDENTS</p> <p>Attitudes towards & behaviour on privacy policies.</p>	<p>Q20 What do you think about privacy policies of the UGCs/SNS that you are using? Did you read them before you signed up? (choose one as an example, If no to Q 7, then any other website that you use frequently) If yes – what would you look for? If you didn't find what you have looking for, what would you do?</p>

[about 4 min]

Probe to determine:

- *if people really read the privacy policy;*
- *what (presence/absence of some feature? reassurance?) they are looking for when they do read privacy policies; and*
- *what they do if what they are looking for isn't in the policy (carry on using the website anyway? not start/stop using it?)*

Running Total: 56 min

ALL RESPONDENTS

That's all from me, is there anything else you would like to add?

Thank & close

Hand out incentives if used

Inform about the next steps, give more information about CONSENT project if respondent wishes

Thank you very much for your valuable contribution to our project!

Total: 60 min

A.2 Interview Guidelines (Bulgarian)

Инструкции за интервюиращите

Тъй като целта на тези интервюта е да се придобие по-задълбочено разбиране за личните мнения, мисли, чувства, преживявания и поведение по отношение на поверителността на база на количествените резултати от Работен пакет 7, от съществено значение е да позволите на респондентите да говорят колкото може по-свободно и да ги насърчите да развият тяхна собствена последователност от мисли, вместо да следват предопределен модел на отговори с 'да'/'не' или при избор от няколко възможни отговора. Очевидно, едно от основните предизвикателства за всеки интервюиращ, провеждащ стандартизирани интервюта с отворен край, е да намери баланса между позволяването на такава отвореност и поддържането на контрол – връщайки се, без да се загуби „червената линия“ – и текстът на въпросите от интервюто отчита това.

Въпреки това, провеждането на интервюта на комплексна тематика винаги ще остане сложна задача и следващите практически препоръки са предназначени да спомогнат за намаляване на част от усложненията.

Планирайте предварително: Уговорете среща с респондента на място по неин/негов избор, където тя/той се чувства спокойна/спокоен, но имайте предвид, че мястото следва да бъде достатъчно уединено, за да се даде възможност за интервю без нежелано разсейване или прекъсвания. Избягвайте напрегнати графици, тъй като чувството за натиск може – неохотно – да се предаде на респондента.

Бъдете запознат/а с насоките на интервюто: Упражнявайте предварително въпросите и прочетете внимателно специфичните инструкции (отбелязани в курсив). Придържайте се към насоките и не скачайте между въпросите.

Бъдете запознат/а с техническото оборудване: Правете кратка проба на записа преди всяко интервю, за да сте сигурни, че записващото устройство работи добре и батериите са достатъчно заредени.

Задавайте отворени въпроси: Особено в случаите, когато проучвате отговора на интервюирания, е изкушаващо да зададете предполагащ отговор въпрос (например „Така, Вие мислите/не мислите, че...?“), на който може да бъде отговорено с просто 'да'/'не'. Такива 'да'/'не' въпроси трябва да бъдат максимално избягвани, тъй като това, което искаме да получим, докато проучваме, са повече подробности за това, което интервюираният мисли, а не просто 'да'/'не'. Опитайте се да продължите да задавате отворени директни въпроси и използвайте други проучващи техники като съпричастност, изчаквателни паузи или подражание, предоставяйки на респондента достатъчно време да даде допълнителни подробности.

Бъдете нащрек: Въпреки че е важно да бъде интерактивен/а, основната задача на интервюиращия е да слуша и да наблюдава по време на разговора. Също така е препоръчително да останете нащрек и евентуално да си водите записки след интервюто, тъй като респондентите често дават съществена информация непосредствено след като записващото устройство е изключено.

Въведение	Инструктаж
<p>ВСИЧКИ РЕСПОНДЕНТИ</p> <p>Въведение</p> <p>[около 5 мин.]</p> <p>(a) Благодаря Ви (b) Вашето име (c) Цел (d) Конфиденциалност (e) Продължителност (f) Как ще протече интервюто (g) Подпис за съгласие върху формата за съгласие</p>	<p>Бих искал/а да Ви благодаря, че отделихте време да се срещнем днес. Аз се казвам ----- и бих искал/а да поговоря с Вас за Интернет, какво му харесвате, какво не харесвате, как го използвате.</p> <p>Както споменах, когато уговорихме тази среща, това интервю се осъществява като част от проект CONSENT, който се реализира с финансовата подкрепа на Европейската комисия. CONSENT има за цел да събере гледните точки на Интернет потребители от всички страни в Европейския съюз. Ако желаете, в края на интервюто ще Ви дам повече информация за проекта.</p> <p>Вашето мнение е много ценно за нашето изследване и ще бъде взето предвид при съставянето на окончателния доклад. Интервюто ще отнеме по-малко от един час. Ще записвам сесията на аудио носител, защото не искам да пропусна някой от Вашите коментари. Въпреки че ще си водя записки по време на сесията, не бих могъл/могла да пиша достатъчно бързо, за да отразя всичко. Тъй като сме на запис, ще Ви помоля да говорите високо и ясно, за да не изпуснем някой от Вашите коментари.</p> <p>Всички отговори ще са поверителни. Това означава, че Вашите отговори по време на интервюто ще бъдат споделени само с други изследователи по проекта и ние гарантираме, че всяка информация, която включим в нашия доклад, няма да Ви идентифицира като респондент. Вашето име по никакъв начин няма да е съотнесено към отговорите.</p> <p>Моля да прочетете и да подпишете тази форма за съгласие. Имате ли някакви въпроси в тази връзка?</p> <p>Помнете, че не е необходимо да говорите за нещо, за което не желаете, и по всяко време може да прекратите интервюто. Така добре ли е?</p> <p><i>Текущо до момента: 5 мин.</i></p>
Цели	Въпроси
<p>ВСИЧКИ РЕСПОНДЕНТИ</p> <p>Упражнение с асоциации на думи</p>	<p>В.1 Като за начало ще поиграем на кратка игра/направим кратко упражнение: Аз ще Ви прочитам дума и бих искал/а да казвате първите няколко неща, които Ви идват на ум/които изникват в главата Ви, когато чуете думата. Нека първо да</p>

<p>[около 3 мин.]</p> <p>- установете най-първите асоциации с връзка с обработката на лични данни</p>	<p>опитаме с пример: Кое е първото, което Ви идва на ум, ако кажа думата „лято“? Нещо друго?</p> <p><i>Окуражете респондентите да използват кратки фрази или отделни думи и да избягват дълги описания и изказвания.</i></p> <p>Тестови думи: честност, интернет, работа, семейство, поверителност</p> <p><i>Текущо до момента: 8 мин.</i></p>
<p>ВСИЧКИ РЕСПОНДЕНТИ</p> <p>Готовност за разкриване на лична информация в различни ситуации [около 8 мин.]</p>	<p>В.1.1 Сега нека да поговорим за нещо малко по-различно. Бих искал/а да си представите, че сте в самолет и човекът до Вас, някой, когото не познавате и надали ще срещнете някога отново, е много разговорлив представител от същия пол на около Вашата възраст. Той /тя започва да говори за различни неща и след 15 минути той/тя Ви пита дали сте необвързан/а, женен/омъжена или имате връзка, какво ще му отговорите? <i>Позволете на респондента да отговори свободно и ако не даде причини защо ще постъпи по този начин, само тогава питайте ‘защо’/‘защо не’.</i></p> <p>В.1.2 Ако той/тя Ви попита колко печелите, какво ще направите? <i>Позволете на респондента да отговори свободно, и ако не даде причини защо ще постъпи по този начин, само тогава питайте ‘защо’/‘защо не’.</i></p> <p>В.1.3 А ако Ви каже, че може да използва номера на личната си карта, за да избира числа за лотарията, за да играе, и той /тя Ви попита какъв е номерът на Вашата лична карта? Какво ще направите? <i>Позволете на респондента да отговори свободно, и ако не даде причини защо ще постъпи по този начин, само тогава питайте ‘защо’/‘защо не’.</i></p> <p>В.1.4 Сега, нека си представим, че вместо този разговорлив пътник, същите въпроси са Ви зададени от приятел, с когото се срещате няколко пъти в годината. Какво ще направите? <i>Изследвайте за всяко от: дали сте необвързан, женен/омъжена или във връзка; колко печелите; номер на лична карта. И във всеки един случай – дали респондентът би казал истината и ‘защо’/‘защо не’.</i> <i>Текущо до момента: 16 мин.</i></p>
<p>ВСИЧКИ РЕСПОНДЕНТИ</p> <p>Опит с Интернет и нагласи [около 5 мин.]</p>	<p>В.2 Нека сега да поговорим малко повече за Интернет. От колко време използвате Интернет?</p> <p>В.3 Какво най-много обичате по отношение на Интернет?</p> <p>В.4 Какво най-много не харесвате по отношение на Интернет? <i>Текущо до момента: 21 мин.</i></p>

<p>ВСИЧКИ РЕСПОНДЕНТИ</p> <p>Основни убеждения и нагласи към търговска размяна на лични данни [около 5 мин.]</p>	<p>В.5 Представете си, че посещавате интернет страница на клуб за отстъпки, например страница подобна на Groupon <или подобна, моля да изберете най-подходящата такава за вашата страна>. Клубът предлага на своите членове до 50% отстъпки на различни потребителски продукти и услуги (напр. книги, пътуване, стоки за домашна употреба, модни аксесоари). В момента на интернет страницата тече промоция и се дава отстъпка от до 75 % на всички посетители, които предоставят на интернет страницата повече информация от стандартните име и електронна поща. Коя информация сте склонни да предоставите, за да получите тази отстъпка от до 75%?</p> <p>Започнете да четете по списък: телефонен номер, домашен адрес, рождена дата, годишен доход, семейно положение, брой деца, възраст на децата, номер на лична карта или паспорт, електронна поща на партньор или съпруг/а, статус на застраховка „Живот“, статус на застраховка „Имущество“.</p> <p>За нещата, за които респондента <u>няма</u> желание да предостави информация на интернет страницата, проучете причината: В.5.i Защо не? Или Защо няма да дадете Вашата...</p> <p>Текущо до момента: 26 мин.</p>
<p>ВСИЧКИ РЕСПОНДЕНТИ</p> <p>Използване на интернет [около 2 мин.]</p>	<p>В.6 Моля да ми разкажете малко за интернет страниците, които използвате през една типична за Вас седмица и за какво ги използвате.</p> <p>Проучете дали посочените дейности в интернет (включително използването на генерирано от потребителите съдържание и услуги на социалните мрежи) имат въздействие върху начина на живот, навиците и социалните връзки на респондента (само 2 минути за този въпрос, така че не навлизайте в прекалено много подробности).</p> <p>Текущо до момента: 28 мин.</p>
<p>ВСИЧКИ РЕСПОНДЕНТИ</p> <p>Използване генерирано от потребителите съдържание [около 5 мин.]</p> <p>- Установете дали е</p>	<p>В.7 Това е списък с няколко интернет страници <покажете списък с интернет страници с генерирано от потребителя съдържание, използван във всяка страна по Работен пакет 7>. Можете ли да ми кажете дали имате акаунти (а не просто дали ги посещавате) в някои от тях и ако имате акаунт, колко често ‘влизате’ в сайта? <Отбележете дали респондента използва Интернет страница на социална мрежа и ако не, коя страница с генерирано от потребителите съдържание</p>

ползвател или не на генерирано от потребителите съдържание

- Установете дали е ползвател на социални мрежи

- Установете кои интернет страници с генерирано от потребителите съдържание се използват често

- Предоставете връзка с констатациите на онлайн анкетата

Покажете карта А

РЕСПОНДЕНТИ, КОИТО НЕ ИЗПОЛЗВАТ ИЛИ ВЕЧЕ НЕ ИЗПОЛЗВАТ ИНТЕРНЕТ СТРАНИЦИ С ГЕНЕРИРАНО ОТ ПОТРЕБИТЕЛИТЕ СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ ВЪВ В.7

Причини за неизползване на интернет страници с генерирано от потребителя съдържание [около 3 мин.]

респондентът използва най-много>

Покажете карта А:

А. Интернет страница на социална мрежа като Facebook, <Местна социална мрежа, използвана по Работен пакет 7>

Б. Интернет страници на бизнес ориентирани социални мрежи като LinkedIn, Xing.com

В. Интернет страници за запознанства като parship.com

Г. Интернет страници, чрез които можете да споделяте снимки, видео клипове и др. като Youtube, flickr

Д. Интернет страници, които предоставят препоръки и ревьюта (на филми, музика, книги, хотели и др.) като last.fm, tripadvisor

Е. Страници за микро блогове като twitter

Ж. Уики –интернет страници като Wikipedia, myheritage

3. Онлайн игри за много играчи като secondlife.com, World of Warcraft

Проучете колко време дневно/седмично се прекарва в социалните мрежи и услуги с генерирано от потребителите съдържание (ако вече не е установено във В.6)

Текущо до момента: 33 мин.

В.8 Защо нямате акаунти в някои от тези интернет страници или защо сте ги прекратили или не ги използвате вече? Нещо да добавите?

Проучете изцяло, но си отбележете първата и втората посочени причини.

Интересуваме се от допълнително проучване на всякакви причини, свързани с опасенията на респондентите за:

- последиците от предоставяне на информация онлайн,
- как информацията за тях се използва,
- дали на интернет страниците с генерирано от потребителите съдържание може да се има доверие, и
- всеки друг въпрос, свързан с обработката на лични данни.

Ако въпроси, свързани с обработката на личните данни/използването на информация/доверието не са споменати като причина за неизползването (вече) на интернет страници с генерирано от потребителите съдържание, попитайте:

В.9 По какви причини има вероятност скоро да

си откриете акаунт – или да не си откриете акаунт в някоя от тези интернет страници?

Позволете на респондентите да говорят свободно, но после внимателно проучете, за да установите дали отговарящият изпитва някакъв натиск да си открие акаунт с генерирано от потребителя съдържание.

Ако обработката на личните данни/използването на информация/свързани с доверието въпроси са споменати, попитайте:

V10. Споменавате, че една от причините (причината) да не използвате интернет страници с генерирано от потребителите съдържание е <каквото е казал респондента във връзка с обработката на личните данни/ използването на информация>. Можете ли да ми кажете малко повече за това какво точно Ви притеснява?

Проучете в дълбочина, за да определите

- i. какви аспекти на интернет страниците с генерирани от потребителя съдържание респондентът намира за неприемливи, и защо;
- ii. убеждения за това как интернет страниците използват информация;
- iii. убеждения за какво са страниците с генерирано от потребителя съдържание.

Текущо до момента: 36 мин.

**РЕСПОНДЕНТИ,
КОИТО ИЗПОЛЗВАТ
ИНТЕРНЕТ СТРАНИЦИ
С ГЕНЕРИРАНО ОТ
ПОТРЕБИТЕЛИТЕ
СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ ВЪВ V7**

Интернет страници с
генерирано от
потребителите
съдържание –
мотивация &
използване
[около 6 мин.]

Установете:
- обосновки за
използване на
генерирано от
потребителите
съдържание
- готовност за
споделяне на

V.11 Защо започнахте да използвате <Интернет страница на социална мрежа, ако се използва. Ако респондентът не използва страница на социална мрежа, тогава споменете използваната най-често интернет страница с генерирано от потребителите съдържание от V.7>? Проучете, за да определите основните мотиви за използване на страницата.

V.12 През цялото време, през което сте използвали тези интернет страници, каква информация за себе си сте публикували на тази страница/страници?

Оставете на респондентите време да помислят и да отговорят със свои думи, но проучете за: име, домашен адрес, Ваши снимки, снимки на семейство и приятели, аудио-видео записи, медицинска информация, хобита, спортове, места, на които сте били, вкусове и мнения и т.н.

V.13 Кой може да вижда Вашия профил и/или Вашите

информация;
- убеждения &
нагласи към
различните видове
информация;
- мотивировка за
използване на
настройки за това кой
може да вижда
информацията

снимки?

Проучете В.15 **Защо сте нагласили настройките по този начин?**

В.14 Някога съжалявали ли сте за публикуване на някаква информация на тези страници?

Ако да: **В.15** Може ли да ми разкажете малко за това... какво се случи? Защо съжалихте за публикуването на информацията?

Ако респондентът не спомене търговска информация & отрицателни ефекти, тогава задайте също 16.1 и 16.2.

Ако не: **В.16** Можете ли да си представите ситуация, в която бихте съжалили за това?

Проучете, за да установите дали липсата на загриженост за публикуването на информация от страна на самия респондент се дължи на:

i. респондентът публикува малко информация, или

ii. винаги премисля внимателно преди да публикува, или

iii. мисли, че не е проблем всеки да има достъп до информацията за него/нея.

Ако НЕ е i и ii, тогава попитайте:

16.1 Получавате ли търговска информация, която мислите, че е в резултат на личната информация, която сте публикували? Ако да, как се чувствате от това?

Прочуete, за да определите точно:

iv. дали респондентите са наясно с последиците от поставяне на информация онлайн;

v. защо някои последици са по-приемливи от други;

vi. дали хората приемат, че получаването на търговска информация е част от търговската размяна за използване на услугата.

16.2 Какво мислите, че може да се случи (например по отношение на подбор за работа, репутация) като резултат от личната информация, която сте публикували?

Как мислите, че ще се случи това?

Проучете, за да определите точно какво мислят респондентите за други хора, използващи тяхната собствена информация, публикувана на интернет страници с генерирано от потребителите съдържание. Използвайте неутрален тон, за да позволите както положителни, така и отрицателни реакции.

Текущо до момента: 42 мин

ВСИЧКИ РЕСПОНДЕНТИ

Използване на
псевдоними/прякор
и
[около 2 мин.]

- проучете нагласите
за разкриване на
лична информация в
различни ситуации

Ако до този момент не е установено

V.17 Самият Вие някога използвали ли сте псевдоним или прякор, когато сте предоставяли информация онлайн? В какъв/и случай/случаи и защо? Ако не сте, какво мислите за това?

Проучете по-подробно

Текущо до момента: 44 мин

ВСИЧКИ РЕСПОНДЕНТИ

Нагласи спрямо
използването на
лична информация
от интернет страници
[около 8 мин.]

Покажете карта
Б

V.18 Информацията, която потребителите включват в техните акаунти или профили на интернет страница, може да бъде използвана от собствениците на интернет страницата за редица цели, като: да персонализират съдържанието и рекламите, които потребителите виждат, да им изпращат съобщения по електронната поща, да събират в дълбочина лична информация за тях и т.н. Знаехте ли това, когато сте се регистрирали в интернет страницата (или сайт с генерирано от потребителя съдържание/социална мрежа)? Какво мислите за това?

Отбележете дали респондентът е бил наясно с целите и проучете, за да определите нагласата за използване на информацията на потребителите за всяко от следните:

Покажете карта Б:

4. персонализиране на рекламите, които виждате (показват Ви се само реклами на предмети/услуги, които вероятно биха Ви заинтересували);
5. споделяне на информация (която би могла да бъде свързана с Вашето име) за Вашето поведение онлайн с други части на компанията;
6. продажба на информация (която не е свързана с Вашето име) за Вашето поведение онлайн на други компании.

За всяка една цел проучете за причината, поради която респондентът намира използването за приемливо/неприемливо.

	<p>Ако все още не е споменато, за всяка причина, поради която респондентът смята, че е неприемливо, попитайте:</p> <p>V.19 При какви условия, ако има такива, бихте намерили за приемливо за потребителите да позволяват информация за тях самите да бъде използвана от интернет страницата за <причина, която респондентът счита за неприемлива>?</p> <p><i>Проучете, за да установите дали респондентът би приел билет за тотализатор/лотария, точки на интернет страница като напр. Facebook точки, дял от печалбите от интернет страницата, пари.</i></p> <p>Текущо до момента: 52 мин.</p>
<p>ВСИЧКИ РЕСПОНДЕНТИ</p> <p>Нагласи към & поведение по отношение на политиките за обработка на лични данни</p> <p>[около 4 мин.]</p>	<p>B20 Какво мислите за политиките за обработване на лични данни на страниците с генерирано от потребителите съдържание/социалните мрежи, които използвате? Прочетохте ли ги преди да се регистрирате? (изберете една като пример, ако не от B.7, то тогава всяка друга интернет страница, която използвате често)</p> <p>Ако да – За какво гледате? Ако не намерите, това което търсите, какво бихте направили?</p> <p><i>Проучете, за да определите:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - дали хората наистина четат политиките за обработване на лични данни; - за какво (наличие/отсъствие на някоя функция? успокоение?) гледат, когато четат политиките за обработване на лични данни; и - какво правят, ако това, което търсят, не е в политиката за обработване на лични данни (продължават да използват интернет страницата въпреки това? не започват/спират да я използват?) <p>Текущо до момента: 56 мин.</p>
<p>ВСИЧКИ РЕСПОНДЕНТИ</p> <p>Благодарете приключете интервюто</p> <p>& с</p>	<p>Това е всичко от мен, има ли нещо друго, което бихте искали да добавите?</p> <p><i>Ако считате за полезно, поощрете за участието. Информирайте за следващите стъпки, ако отговарящият желае, дайте повече информация за проекта CONSENT.</i></p> <p>Много благодаря за Вашия ценен принос към нашия проект!</p> <p>Общо: 60 мин.</p>

B. Pre-Analysis Template

Interview Country:	_____	Interviewer (name):	_____
Date:	_____	Interview number:	_____
Interviewee age:	_____	Gender:	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
			<input type="checkbox"/> Male
		Location:	<input type="checkbox"/> urban / suburban
			<input type="checkbox"/> rural
SNS/UGC usage:	<input type="checkbox"/> SNS/UGC user		
	<input type="checkbox"/> UGC (non-SNS) user		
	<input type="checkbox"/> SNS/UGC non-user		

Description of interview situation / overall impression:

Here, the idea of such general description is to provide a sense of how the interview went, and a general feeling of how the interviewee behaved during the interview. The interviewer (and/or the person transcribing the interview / filling out the template) is encouraged to reflect upon the general tone (e.g. relaxed, stiff), emotional expression (e.g. enthusiastic, reserved, interested, keen) and language use (e.g. formal/informal, precise, casual choice of words) of/by the interviewee as well as any specific content that is considered particularly important, e.g. highlighting contradictory statements, shifting perspectives and perceived ambivalences. Any quotes are particularly welcome!

A. Word Associations (Q1)

	Word Associations <i>(Please use single words or short phrases)</i>
Honesty	
Internet	
Work	
Family	
Privacy	

B. General Attitudes and Behaviour towards Disclosure of Personal Information

Willingness to give the following information:

To "Strangers"	Yes	No	Other <i>(please specify)</i>	Reasons
Marital Status (Q1.1)				
Income (Q1.2)				
ID Number (Q1.3)				

To Friends	Yes	No	Other <i>(please specify)</i>	Reasons
Marital Status (Q1.4)				
Income (Q1.4)				
ID Number (Q1.4)				

Additional Quotes:

C. Years of Internet Usage **(Q2):**

D. General Internet-related Attitudes

Positive Aspects of the Internet (“love most”) (Q3)	e.g. broadness of information, entertainment, worldwide networking, source of inspiration
Negative Aspects of the Internet (“dislike most”) (Q4)	e.g. misleading information, meaningless chatting, source of distraction, peer pressure to use SNS websites

Additional Quotes:

E. Commercial “Trade-Off’s” (Q5, Q5.i)

Information the interviewee would be willing to provide for a large discount on online purchases or services:

	Yes	No	Reasons
Phone Number			
Home Address			
Date of Birth			
Annual Income			
Marital Status			
Number of Kids			
Age of Kids			
ID / Passport Number			
Email address of partner/spouse			
Life Insurance Status			
Home Insurance Status			
Other			

Additional Quotes:

F. Everyday Internet Routines (Q6, Q7)

Frequency per day/week of

	Frequency	Potential Impact on lifestyle, habits, social relationships
Checking Emails		
Using Search Engines		
Using SNS websites (<i>which?</i>)		
Using other UGC websites (<i>which?</i>)		
Checking News		
Other (<i>please specify</i>)		

Additional Quotes:

G. SNS/UGC-related Perceptions, Attitudes and Behaviour

G.1 Interviewee holding / not holding accounts with one or more of the following sites (Q7, Q8, and Q11):

	Yes	No	Reasons for closing / not using the account anymore	Reasons for starting to use the account (Q11)
SNS websites (<i>e.g. Facebook, local SNS websites</i>)				
Business networking websites (<i>e.g. LinkedIn</i>)				
Dating websites (<i>e.g. parship.com</i>)				
Photo/video sharing websites (<i>e.g. Flickr,</i>				

<i>YouTube)</i>				
Websites providing reviews (<i>e.g. tripadvisor</i>)				
Micro blogging sites (<i>e.g. Twitter</i>)				
Wiki sites (<i>e.g. Wikipedia</i>)				
Multiplayer online games <i>e.g. World of Warcraft</i>)				

Additional Quotes:

G.2 Likelihood of SNS/UGC non-users to open an Account in the future (Q9)

	Likely	Not so likely	Reasons
SNS websites (<i>e.g. Facebook, local SNS websites</i>)			
Business networking websites (<i>e.g. LinkedIn</i>)			
Dating websites (<i>e.g. parship.com</i>)			
Photo/video sharing websites (<i>e.g. Flickr, YouTube</i>)			
Websites providing reviews (<i>e.g. tripadvisor</i>)			
Micro blogging sites (<i>e.g. Twitter</i>)			
Wiki sites (<i>e.g. Wikipedia</i>)			

Multiplayer online games <i>e.g. World of Warcraft</i>			

Additional Quotes:

G.3 Specific Privacy Concerns of SNS/UGC non-users (Q10)

Please quote the interviewees response to question 10; if she/he doesn't have any concerns regarding privacy in the context of opening/not opening or closing any SNS/UGC account, please indicate the reasons why (if given by the interviewee).

G.4 Personal Information Disclosure on UGC websites (Q12, Q13)

Name / Type of website		Type of information disclosed	Reasons for disclosure	Disclosure Strategies <i>(e.g. leaving questions blank, looking for similar websites that require less information)</i>
		Name		
		Home address		
		Photos of the interviewee		
		Photos of the interviewee's family & friends		
		Audio-video recordings		
		Medical information		
		Hobbies		
		Sports		
		Places where the interviewee has been		
		Tastes and opinions		
		Other		

Additional Quotes:

G.5 Privacy Settings (Q13)

Name / type of website	Form of setting <i>(e.g. stricter, less strict, limiting who can see personal information, (de-)activating newsletters / commercial offers, further usage of personal information provided)</i>	Motivation for this form of privacy setting
<i>(add lines if required)</i>		

Specific Quotes:

G.6 Consequences of Disclosing Personal Information (Q14, Q15, Q16, Q16.2)

	Situation where the disclosure of information was regretted	Consequences
Actual (own) experience		
Experiences of <u>others</u>		
Imagining <u>future</u> situations		

Specific Quotes:

G.6.1 Commercial Offers as a result of disclosing personal information (Q16.1)

Receiving commercial offers as a result of having disclosed personal information is		Reasons / Conditions
Acceptable		
Not acceptable		
Acceptable under conditions		

Specific Quotes:

G.7 Using an alias or a nickname (Q17)

		Reasons for/against using an alias or nickname
Yes		
No		

Specific Quotes:

G.8 Interviewee's Awareness of website owners using personal information for a number of purposes (Q18, Q19)

	Awareness		How did the interviewee learn about this	Attitude	Reaction / Resulting Behaviour
Customising the content and advertising users see	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Passing on personal information to third parties without permission	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Sending unwanted emails / newsletter	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Selling personal information to other companies	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				
Gather in-depth information about users	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Before opening the account <input type="checkbox"/> After opening the account		<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable under conditions	
	No				

Specific Quotes:

G.9 Privacy Policies (Q20)

G.9.1 Reading privacy policies

Reading privacy policies before signing up		Reasons
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mostly yes	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mostly not	

G.9.2 Content of privacy policies

Beliefs about privacy policies ("What do you think about privacy policies")	
Content expected to find ("What do you look for")	
Action taken if not found	
Other comments	

Specific Quotes:
